DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 731 SO 035 076

AUTHOR	Bickmore, Kathy
TITLE	Discipline for Democracy? Neutrality and Justice in Schools' Management of Conflict and Social Exclusion.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship Education; Democracy; *Discipline; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; School Effectiveness; *School Role
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; Conceptual Frameworks; *Conflict Management; *Social Exclusion

ABSTRACT

Knowledge and values for good citizenship are communicated through explicit subject-area curriculum, such as social studies, health, and language arts, and through the implicit models and practices embedded in a school's system of human rights protections and discipline practices. This paper presents the conceptual framework, and a few very early and partial results, of a three year research project that investigates policies and programs (implicit and explicit curriculum) that are designed to facilitate the development of safe and/or inclusive schools. The paper explains that the study's focus is on school districts' patterns of practice discipline procedures (regulations and sanctions) and learning expectations (teaching guidelines, resources, and staff support) regarding conflict, violence, human rights, and diversity. It states that the context of the study focuses on a few large Canadian urban school districts with diverse student populations. The paper discusses the methods of several large Canadian cities in handling discipline problems and describes divergent patterns of citizenship education practices. (Contains 95 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Discipline for Democracy? Neutrality and Justice in Schools' Management of Conflict and Social Exclusion.

Kathy Bickmore

ED 478 731

SO 035 076

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Bickmore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Discipline for democracy?
Neutrality and justice in schools' management of conflict and social exclusion

Kathy Bickmore
(kbickmore@oise.utoronto.ca)

(*DRAFT* for presentation)
American Educational Research Association; Chicago, Illinois
April 20, 2003

> *But a problem arises as soon as we attempt to define which values, attitudes, beliefs and skills we desire others to learn.... Indoctrination in the name of god, country and goodness may simply be replaced by talk of the right way to make peace and justice, end war and structural violence, enhance social justice, deepen environmental security, and expand creative forms of dispute resolution. The higher or more sacred the values, the more certain we are of the virtue of our position. Is education for peace, therefore, little more than a newfangled version of indoctrination?*
>
> *— Larry Fisk (2000, p.181)*

Citizenship education, whether toward obedient patriotic chauvinism or toward democratization, is inescapably associated with the development of values. For example, as a citizenship educator I would like to work toward eliminating the most egregious impediments to democratic community — overt violence and persistent patterns of social exclusion. While schools alone cannot completely abolish hatred, education can make a difference in reducing intolerance and premeditated hateful behavior (Avery et. al. 1997, Bush & Saltarelli 2000). Surely the development of *skills* such as conflict management and critical reading, and *substantive knowledge* such as understanding of diverse human identities and societies, can contribute to the reduction of hateful behavior. However, the learner's subjective system of beliefs or *values* is also crucial, since this is what shapes their inclinations to autonomously employ that knowledge in nonviolent inclusive behavior. To teach toward democracy and peace is to insist on their value as social goals.

Let us assume that facilitating the learning or development of values is a valid goal for citizenship education; indeed it is impossible to encode and communicate knowledge (teach) without teaching values (e.g. Ellsworth 1997, Freire 1998, Werner 1991). Beliefs and judgements are embedded in skills and substantive knowledge, as well as in school-based patterns of human interaction. Certainly there is no guarantee that students will actually learn the citizenship values their teachers intend; nevertheless any educational initiative embodies and (consciously or unconsciously) promotes particular values. To "indoctrinate" is to teach a doctrine — a system of value-laden beliefs or judgements (Gage *Canadian Concise Dictionary*, 2002). The notion of indoctrination is generally invoked as an accusation, implying that educators have misused their power —

inculcating not just any values, but values to which the accuser objects. The periodic accusations of indoctrination leveled against citizenship education present learning opportunities, by provoking clarification of the value-laden nature and consequences of educational policies and programs.

Knowledge and values for 'good citizenship' are communicated through explicit subject-area curriculum (especially social studies, health, and language arts) and, at least as importantly, through the implicit models and practice embedded in a school's system of human rights protections and discipline practices. This paper presents the conceptual framework, and a few very early and partial results, of a new three-year research project that investigates policies and programs (implicit and explicit curriculum) that are designed to facilitate the development of 'safe' and/or 'inclusive' schools. Young people's citizenship is shaped by these policies and programs, both directly as a means to achieve safety and inclusivity (teaching students how they should behave), and indirectly as a consequence of the associated institutional roles and practices (socializing students' experiences and expectations of self and others, through the diverse ways they behave and are treated in the social system). The study's focus is on school districts' patterns of practice — discipline procedures (regulations and sanctions) and learning expectations (teaching guidelines, resources, and staff support) — regarding conflict, violence, human rights, and diversity.

The context of the study is a few large urban school districts with differently-diverse student populations, in different Canadian provinces. The current era is an especially interesting time for such a study, because the pressures for accountability, achievement testing, and strict 'zero tolerance' behavior control foreground the contested question of what young citizens should learn in school, and how they should be supported to do so. Schools in central cities are uniquely important microsocieties that demonstrate the kinds of citizenship education that are possible, as well as needed (Metz 2002). Daily, urban schools bring together vibrant and volatile combinations of young people, many of them marginalized from the so-called mainstream by poverty, racism, and cultural isolation. The educators in these inner-city schools delicately balance the demands of maintaining safety (in the face of very real frustration, anger, and social fragmentation) with the mission of fostering autonomy, social inclusion, and academic success (in the face of deprivation and standardization). It is probably no accident that the worst sensationalized episodes of youth-on-youth violence typically have not taken place in urban schools, as prevailing stereotypes might predict: urban educators have, at least in some city school systems, a special wisdom of practice built from having faced and handled the challenges of making peace and providing good education at the same time under stressful conditions. At the same time, the currently fashionable standardized approach to high-stakes testing (as well as discipline regulation) is often implemented in ways that ignore both the special needs and the special wisdom of large urban school districts (Cuban 2001, Darling-Hammond 2003). Instead of using tests or behavior codes as safety nets and diagnostic tools that would facilitate allocation of resources where they are most needed, these accountability measures sometimes function to narrow urban educators' capacities to respond to the challenges they encounter. Thus the innovations and gains in some city school systems are poignantly fragile. One of the most insidious forms of indoctrination is the appalling undercurrent in some current

reforms that presents certain young people, especially the poor and cultural minorities, as somehow undeserving or at fault for their difference from the so-called mainstream, even for their own marginalization.

Socializing values: Implicit (discipline) and explicit (social education) curriculum

One of the most prominent elements in the culture of public schooling is regulation. An educator must develop and assert their authority to manage the behavior of large groups of students. 'Control' and discipline often remain major concerns for teachers and administrators, as novices and throughout their careers. Public pressures for accountability seem to exacerbate this emphasis on control, by increasing the perceived need to demonstrate well-regulated effects (in relation to safety and violence as well as academic achievement). Continuing rapid social and demographic change in North America (resulting from such factors as global mass communications, international immigration, and racialized patterns of poverty and wealth) makes school cultures particularly dynamic and their regulation a particular challenge. The resulting social citizenship practice, regulated through the implicit curriculum of behavior management, is an extremely important foundation of students' social learning.

The eruption of visible conflicts highlights the value-laden nature of school discipline, in addition to values in formal curriculum. There is increasing critique of racial, social class, and cultural biases in school-based discipline practices (e.g. R. Gordon et.al. 2000, Johnston 2000, Jull 2000, McCadden 1998, Noguera 1995, Sheets & Gay 1996). Policy and professional knowledge do make a difference in such practices: Callender and Wright, for example, describe a school context in which school sanctions position Black pupils as 'other,' and another school that "utilises school and community sanctions as a mechanism for reinforcing a strong, equitable sense of individual and collective identity and achievement" for diverse pupils (2000, p.234). It is paradoxical to hear calls for supposedly-neutral one-size-fits-all discipline policies at the very time when the *non*-neutrality (dominant culture bias) of predominant approaches to discipline (as well as to racial profiling in policing and punishment patterns outside of schools) are subject to widespread challenge.

There has been similarly broad concern about the racial, gender, national, and cultural biases built into academic curriculum, and the consequent importance of curriculum reforms for helping to overcome intolerance, discrimination, and disengagement. Values embedded in curriculum are rendered visible through contrasting counter-proposals. In particular, many of the curriculum revisions proposed by peace and conflict educators (e.g. Bar-Tal 2001, Deutsch 1993, Fisk 2000, Harris 1999, Reardon 1988, Salomon & Nevo 2002), multicultural anti-bias educators (e.g. Alladin 1996, Banks & Banks 1995, Bickmore 2002b, Henry 1994, Houser 1996, Merelman 1990) have tended to emphasize the importance of values and attitudes. But how might such values best be learned? Clark McCauley (2002) argues that "feet-first" education (changing actual patterns of behavior and interaction, in order that participants develop new beliefs through experience) is often more effective than "head-first" education (attempting to change attitudes and beliefs, in order to eventually affect behavior). This reinforces the insights gained through research on school desegregation in the United States, which demonstrated that changing patterns of inter-group interaction could cause reductions in prejudice, more effectively

than reducing prejudice could cause alterations in patterns of inter-group interaction (cited in Aronson 2000, Cohen 1984). Thus direct teaching of values (indoctrination?) may less effectively transform students' values than indirect socialization through regulation of behavior (such as desegregation or discipline). Explicit curriculum presents important opportunities to learn, but less-visible values education through discipline and human rights practices may be an even more powerful attitudinal influence.

The remainder of this paper introduces a conceptual framework for examining a range of mainly feet-first citizenship-relevant initiatives for safe and/or inclusive schools, and then presents the initial findings of the safe and inclusive schools research project in light of this framework.

Teaching peace, conflict, and equity

Peace and conflict theory describes three basic types of conflict management activity (Curle 1971, Curle & Dugan 1982, Kriesberg 1982, Morrison 2000). These concepts were originally applied to the management of international conflicts, but have been developed and applied to interpersonal as well as inter-group levels in the context of education (Bickmore 2003b, Harris 1999). Since conflict and its management are basic to democracy, these concepts are extended in this project to frame the inquiry into the citizenship education implications of safety and inclusivity initiatives in schools:

(1) Intervention or security approaches known as '**peacekeeping**'
(2) Dispute management and negotiation approaches known as '**peacemaking**'
(3) Longer-range '**peacebuilding**' approaches that aim to prevent future escalation of conflicts, or to restore healthy relationships after outbreaks of violence, by redressing underlying inequities and social conflicts.

The three approaches involve increasing levels of complexity. *Peacekeeping* is the simplest system, in the sense that it relies upon a narrower repertoire of strategies for shaping behavior. Systems that facilitate *peacemaking* generally include some peacekeeping mechanisms. Systems that facilitate *peacebuilding* generally include both peacekeeping and peacemaking mechanisms. Regularized peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding activities in schools shape the modeling, practice, and implicit ideologies of citizen roles that form the foundation of students' citizenship learning.

Peacekeeping attempts to establish safety through control — surveillance, restriction, and punishment of violent behavior. Peacekeeping has a paradoxical relationship to democratic citizenship. On one hand, peacekeeping fulfills the basic need for protection: a measure of safety and security is a prerequisite to democracy, and indeed to education. On the other hand, peacekeeping controls the violent symptoms of escalated conflict through coercion: over-reliance on suppression and the monopoly of power necessary for peacekeeping can block democratization and democratic citizen agency.

In school systems, this approach is reflected in burgeoning provincial and school board emphases on violence 'prevention' and 'zero tolerance' strict discipline policies, including mandated codes of conduct. Such intervention efforts emphasize short-term control of violence and disruption, generally by

punishing or excluding individual students, rather than resolving underlying conflicts or relationship difficulties. Although statistics indicate that youth violence is actually decreasing (American Bar Assn. 2000, Brooks et. al. 2000, Leyton 2000, Jull 2000 Strauss 2000), the prevalence of restrictive and punitive approaches is increasing. Within and beyond schools, a widening variety of youth behavior is being criminalized and managed with standardized punishments (Currie & Covell 1998, Moyer 2001). For example, the city of Edmonton, Alberta recently passed a law making "bullying" children subject to a ticket and $250 fine (Teotino 2003). Discipline, which teaches by example, inevitably shapes and is shaped by cultural, social class, gender, and racial differences (Brantlinger 1994, Greenberg 1995, Kleinfeld 1975, Schwartz 2000 Slee 1995). Top-down security-based discipline, in contrast to education facilitating students' development of self-control, relies upon limits and punishments (suspension and expulsion) that in practice may be disproportionately imposed upon certain populations of students. In spite of these serious risks, however, some form of peacekeeping is essential, especially in urban environments where social instability is most noticeable: reasonably safe schools are the minimum condition upon which the educational enterprise is based.

Teasing, harassment, and bullying are the major mechanisms through which students construct and maintain power hierarchies among their peers on a daily basis (Aronson 2000, T. Gordon et. al. 2000). Bullying is prevalent as an 'underground phenomenon' that can be difficult for school leaders to admit, pinpoint, or prevent (MacDonald 1996, Pepler & Craig 1994). Because of the power imbalance and often embedded social biases that define this kind of conflict and violence, neither peacekeeping alone, nor the relatively simple approaches in prevailing conflict resolution (peacemaking) materials, are sufficient to alleviate harassment and bullying (Larkin 1994, McCaskell 1999, Stein 1995). Clearly a measure of peacekeeping is essential to protect vulnerable students from victimization. At the same time, by itself peacekeeping does not alleviate the social status competition and bias that may form or strengthen the roots of bullying and harassment.

As (implicit) citizenship education, peacekeeping approaches emphasize obedience and blaming/excluding those citizens who do not comply with authority. The value of nonviolence may be embodied by policies that punish violent behavior, but at the same time such punishments rely on (and therefore model/teach the value of) the threat of violence (degradation or forcible exclusion) for their effectiveness. Hierarchy is reinforced, with more powerful adults carrying most responsibility for shaping the social environment, and the agency of students —especially sub-groups of students labeled 'bad'— thereby constrained.

However, there is significant variation among peacekeeping-type initiatives. Strict discipline does not always concentrate primarily on violence. The zero tolerance term was first used in relation to drug use, and this concern is still prominent in some school policies. Other misbehavior such as theft, property damage, and defiance toward authorities also may be punished as heavily as violence. Strict punishment of such a wide range of behavior may be at best ineffective as peacekeeping, as well as counter-democratic, because it could fracture relationships and provoke resistance, especially if certain sub-groups of students were disproportionately blamed relative to their peers

(Noguera 1995). On the other hand, some school districts do focus their strictest sanctions on violence and bias-based behavior, shape implementation with a robust safety net of human rights and equity protections, and follow up initial peacekeeping measures with support for solving problems or learning alternate behaviors. Here, peacekeeping may indeed provide a foundation upon which more complex citizenship development could begin (Bush & Saltarelli 2000, Osler & Starkey 1998).

Peacemaking attempts to facilitate conflict management and resolution through dialogue, deliberation, and problem-solving rather than blame or punishment. Democratic processes such as legislative governance, class meetings, or student councils are themselves peacemaking mechanisms, in that they are procedures designed to facilitate collective decision making in the face of citizens' conflicting wants and needs. Thus democratic practice contributes to peacemaking. Other peacemaking education activities, such as controversial issues discussions in classrooms or peer-assisted conflict resolution, encourage a sense of agency, and the practice of capacities such as dialogue, negotiation, and facilitation, that facilitate democratic citizen participation.

Over the last fifteen years, many new conflict resolution and social skills education programs and resources, intended to reduce aggression and violence among youth, have been developed. Some of these have been implemented sufficiently that research is beginning to provide evidence about the kinds of programs that can help to improve conflict management skills and inclinations, reduce aggressive behavior, and create safer community climates. Peacemaking education initiatives have been most successful in facilitating the nonviolent management of disputes between children of similar social status, through the development of direct communication or mediation skills and procedures (Bickmore 1997 & 2002a, Cunningham et. al. 1998, Jones 1998, Opffer 1997). A major strength of this emerging body of peacemaking education resources is its attention to individual students' skill development, both in stand-alone programs and integrated into academic curricula. Some peacemaking education initiatives, especially those with broad and equitable student involvement, have demonstrated significant association with school engagement and academic achievement (Bickmore 2003a, Carruthers et. al. 1996, Johnson & Johnson 1996).

Peacemaking initiatives explicitly and implicitly teach values by encouraging particular student behavior: compared to peacekeeping policies and programs, students involved in peacemaking are more likely to actively share responsibility for improving their social environments . However, peacemaking initiatives differ in the quality and quantity of citizenship space they generate. Some initiatives emphasize conflict avoidance, control of anger, and/or narrow cultural formulas for appropriate social behavior. Alternatively, programs may invite constructive engagement, creative application of basic principles in diverse ways, and even dissent in controversial matters by diverse students (Lederach 1995). Programs such as peer mediation or student councils delegate tangible responsibility to students (sometimes empowering narrow cadres of 'good' students, and in other cases more inclusively) to autonomously manage conflict (Bickmore 2001). Active student leadership or service learning initiatives present somewhat different citizenship learning opportunities from social skills lessons that are integrated into the curriculum of regular classroom roles. Peacemaking

education resources that over-emphasize dominant culture manners and control support values similar to those underlying peacekeeping, while those that attend more critically to agency and communication, conflict resolution across cultural, language, ideological, or power differences create space for citizen engagement and thus peacebuilding (Bergsgaard 1997, Bettmann & Moore 1994).

Peacebuilding attempts to alleviate inter-group friction and inequities that can cause violence, redirecting and strengthening citizens' relationships through problem solving, restorative justice, critical education and community building. Originally this concept referred primarily to initiatives for re-creating and repairing relationships after outbreaks of violence, but the concepts associated with strengthening or repairing relationships for long-range prevention of additional violence apply equally well to avoiding violence before it occurs or at any point in the process. Democratic ideals include not only collective decision-making and governance *per se*, but also the deepening and broadening of democratic space through redress of injustice, rights violations, and barriers to empowered participation by diverse citizens (e.g. Bickford 1996, Dietz 1989, Gutmann & Thompson 1996). Peacebuilding facilitates this crucial dimension of democracy, by addressing social conflict problems involving bias and discrimination to de-escalate or prevent violence. Peacebuilding is based on restoration (repair of relationships), rather than retribution (punishment).

Overcoming inequity is a key to peacebuilding because inequity is strongly related to violence. A recent study based on analysis of 37 countries' TIMSS data shows that the incidence of school violence is more strongly related to school system factors than to the incidence of violence in each society at large (Akiba et. al. 2003). Specifically, Akiba and his colleagues demonstrate that in school systems that had higher achievement variation between the most- and least-successful students (due to factors such as tracking/streaming, support for failing students, and drop-out or retention efforts), teachers and students reported higher rates of school violence and more concern about the threat of violence. This is strong support for the contention that social exclusion and inequity cause frustrations, social fractures, and/or disengagement that may lead to violence; thus equity efforts likely contribute to peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding citizenship education in schools is reflected in curricular programs including bias awareness, gender equity, anti-racism; global/international, development, Holocaust, and peace education; as well as in structural mechanisms for equity and human rights protection. Knowledge and values for overcoming intolerance, and thus preventing some hateful behavior, can be taught (Avery et.al. 1997, Mock 1995, Prutzman 1994). Democratic citizenship education that is dedicated to helping students to develop accepting attitudes and a sense of responsibility toward unfamiliar, unpopular, or subordinate national or social groups, can be seen as peacebuilding (Bickmore 1993 & 2003b, Boler 1997, Boulding 1988, Bush & Saltarelli 2000, Fisk 2000). Like other democratic educational reforms, peacebuilding emphasizes the development and autonomous implementation of individual and institutional capacities over time, rather than being easily measurable in terms of short-term knowledge or behavior change. Thus such initiatives can take a long time to show effects, and can be difficult to assess reliably (Horowitz & Boardman 1994, Kahne 1996).

Peacebuilding efforts implicitly or explicitly promote values such as the importance of advocacy, self-reflexivity, inclusivity, and justice. As with peacemaking and peacekeeping, however, peacebuilding initiatives in schools are extremely varied. Some (such as many multicultural appreciation exercises) are remarkably conflict avoidant or even assimilationalist, whereas others (such as some antiracism, anti-homophobia, or dialogue efforts) are more willing to confront the difficult controversial justice issues that tend to underlie intractable conflicts. It is the latter, of course, that are most often accused of indoctrination: they are no more value-laden than any other citizenship education, but their biases (by virtue of contrasting with the status quo) are highly visible.

In summary, the concepts of peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding help to make sense of many of the differences and similarities among the myriad citizenship-relevant learning opportunities that are presented by provincial (or state) and school district programs and regulations. These policies and programs teach values — and value-laden roles, responsibilities, and knowledge — explicitly and especially implicitly. To understand what kinds of citizenship might be 'taught' by school districts, this research project is examining the regularized patterns of practice that are shaped by discipline policies, human rights and equity policies, and the programs and staff responsibilities that are created to help meet the goals of these policies.

It is tempting to focus on one particularly visible citizenship education problem — the troubling implications of strict discipline policies for equity and the affirmation of cultural and racial diversity. However, this provides at best a partial picture, even within the realm of peacekeeping. It is important to discern *which* behaviors are treated harshly, and *what else* might be going on to teach nonviolent skills and behavior, to promote understanding and respect across differences, to protect the accused, and to create environments that would be conducive to nonviolent citizen engagement and learning. To teach *democratic* citizenship requires a balance of alternatives and protections relevant to diverse populations and situations, and steady attention to teaching the skills, knowledge and values of peacemaking (such as conflict negotiation and deliberation) and peacebuilding (such as recognizing and overcoming bias) to both staff and students.

The remainder of this paper presents some initial results of a review of citizenship-relevant peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding policies and programs at six big-city school boards with diverse student populations, in six different Canadian provinces. Virtually all of the data were collected from publicly-available documents and websites of the school boards, the six provincial government ministries or departments of education, and the associated province-wide teachers' unions. The emphasis at this early stage is on co-curricular and support programs (such as implementation resources and professional development) and policy documents. Formal classroom curriculum content and practice would be equally relevant to any full picture of citizenship education in schools, but is beyond the scope of this paper. The results of this initial overview should be viewed with some caution, because, as any teacher knows, macro-level policy guidelines are not necessarily closely related to actual practice in schools. (The next phase of the study will focus on three of these school boards to examine the actual implementation, recent history, and

consequences of these policies and programs, including co-curricular as well as formal academic curriculum, in considerably more depth.) What district-level policies and programs *do* reflect, however, is political will and community understandings: people develop policy and programs to deal with problems as they view them. The allocations of resources and effort implied by these program frameworks reflect the concerns and priorities of the polity (albeit not all equitably represented) and leadership in each school system community.

Citizenship education in practice: Peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding

The apparent policy and program environments in the six school districts, as they have emerged so far in the research, vary along a rough continuum from relatively strict contexts that emphasize the peacekeeping dimension to relatively comprehensive, equity-oriented contexts that emphasize peacebuilding in addition to peacekeeping and peacemaking. The cases are presented in three sets of pairs that illustrate what the enabling structures for citizenship education might look like at three points on this continuum. The districts examined are the main urban public school boards in major cities across Canada, ranging in size from 14 000 to 300 000 students with different demographic profiles (city and school district information is summarized in Appendix A).

Zero tolerance peacekeeping: Saint John and Toronto

Curiously, the smallest and largest school districts in the sample were the two with the strictest peacekeeping orientation. Saint John District 8 is the largest district in the relatively sparsely-populated eastern Canadian province of New Brunswick, encompassing the city of Saint John plus some nearby rural areas (41 schools). Saint John's demographic diversity differs from the other cases, in that the largely 'white' population includes a large French-speaking as well as an English-speaking community (New Brunswick is Canada's only officially-bilingual province, with a population that is approximately 34% French/English bilingual and a few monolingual French speakers; Saint John's board operates in both languages although English dominates).[1] Toronto, in contrast, is Canada's largest city with a truly global and rapidly-growing polyglot population, of whom nearly half were born outside the country. The Toronto District School Board, which has the same boundaries as the city, is among the largest school districts in North America. The boundaries of Toronto's city and school district expanded in 1996 and 1998, respectively, when the province of Ontario's conservative government forced the amalgamation of six metropolitan municipalities, and then their six school districts, into one. The same provincial government also passed a series of legislation, including a mandated code of student conduct, that (in combination with substantial budget cuts and the amalgamation of six sets of board policies) transformed Toronto's school policy orientation from peacebuilding to peacekeeping.

Saint John is the only school district in the study sample that has essentially no evident human rights or equity policies or programs at the board or provincial Department of Education level, except for passing references to provincial laws that apply primarily to adults. A different picture may emerge when we finish analyzing formal curriculum documents, but still it is interesting

[1] All demographic information is from Statistics Canada, based on the 2001 Census.

that apparently no system-level staff or program development resources are allocated specifically to facilitating equity or inclusivity education or problem-solving. Saint John's policy documents emphasize behavior that is "not tolerated" and mandate suspension and expulsion, plus recommending control mechanisms such as "a regular police presence in your school" and "prohibiting book bags and coats in the classroom" to reduce students' opportunities to bring in weapons (Crisis Events Protocol 1999 p.3). Removal from school grounds for a range of offences is *mandatory* (Code of Conduct p.3-4). Activities to develop "self esteem, communication, social skills, respect for self and others, self control, productive behaviour, peaceful and cooperative problem solving, conflict resolution, and the practice of democratic principles" are *recommended* (Code of Conduct in Positive Learning Environment Policy, Appendix A.7, New Brunswick Department of Education, revised 2001). About half of the misbehaviors "not tolerated" involve violence or threat (the first four result in immediate suspension and notification of police):

- unprovoked physical assault/ aggression/ malicious acts
- threatening or abusive language
- criminal harassment
- possession or selling of weapons

- discrimination based on gender, race, colour, national or ethnic origin, religion, culture, language group, sexual orientation, disability, age or grade level
- dissemination of hate propaganda including hate literature
- intimidation and bullying

The other "unacceptable behaviour" listed in Saint John's code includes a range of essentially nonviolent offenses (the first three result in immediate suspension and involvement of police):

- use or possession of alcohol or illegal drugs
- possession/ use/ selling of illegal substances
- theft or intentional property damage

- defiance, refusal to work, or refusal to comply
- accusations involving falsehood or malicious intent
- creating or attempting to create a disturbance

(Saint John District 8 Positive Learning Environment Plan 2001, p. 3-4)

Similarly, Saint John's Student Harassment policy prohibits the display of pornographic material as well as violent conduct (sexual, racial or religious insults). While the Positive Learning Environment policy appears to support general obedience and conflict avoidance more thoroughly than erasing prejudice, it does identify bias-based violence as unacceptable; this is reinforced by the harassment policy. Thus the behavioral code indicates some concern about curbing discriminatory expression as well as general violence, although preventative and proactive educational initiatives for this purpose are not visible in school district staffing or program frameworks.

These policies appear to embody widely-held concern about violence and discipline in Saint John. Discipline policies are the topic of nearly all of the

extensive body of parent information documents. The New Brunswick Teachers Association published a thick resource document for teachers on discipline and classroom management in 1999, and identified discipline as the Association's priority for the school year 2002-03 (website). The NBTA also had an Equity in Education Committee — the only evident equity initiative (beyond the above punishment protocol) that might be implemented in Saint John's schools. The board website advertises its "internationally known" Nonviolent Crisis Intervention program, which involves professional development on controlling aggressive behavior.

Like Saint John, the Toronto District School Board's code of conduct is overwhelmingly based on mandatory regulations from the provincial government. Even beyond Saint John, Ontario's (and thus Toronto's) policy mandates expulsions in addition to police involvement as minimum consequences for a wide range of offenses, and severe suspension minimums for an even wider range of behaviors. Expulsion may involve limited [from that school] or full [from any school] exclusion for a minimum of 21 school days, plus conditions for any future re-entry. About two thirds of offenses for which expulsion is mandatory, and about one sixth of offenses for which suspension is mandatory, involve violence or direct threat of violence:

- use a weapon to inflict harm (expulsion = minimum penalty)
- use a weapon to threaten (expulsion)
- serious physical assault necessitating medical treatment (expulsion)
- sexual assault (expulsion)
- possess a weapon on school grounds (expulsion)

- traffic in weapons (suspension = minimum penalty)

The only leeway the Toronto school board has, in the context of provincial policy, is to add more offenses to the list of mandatory suspensions. Its code of conduct is the same as the Ontario Ministry of Education's, except that it also mandates punishment for the following discrimination-based behavior, plus one apparently nonviolent behavior:

- sexual harassment (suspension = minimum penalty)
- racial harassment (suspension)
- distribution of hate material (suspension)
- hate-motivated violence (suspension)

- inappropriate use of electronic communications/ media (suspension)

The following essentially nonviolent behaviors are also criminalized in Toronto schools, requiring suspension or expulsion in every case, by mandate of the provincial policy:

- drug trafficking (expulsion = minimum penalty)
- providing alcohol to minors (expulsion)
- robbery (expulsion)

- drug possession (suspension = minimum penalty)
- alcohol possession (suspension)
- being under the influence of drugs or alcohol (suspension)

- serious vandalism (suspension)
- swearing at "a teacher or other person in authority" (suspension)

(— Code of Conduct from Ontario Safe Schools Act 2000, sections 306 & 309; Toronto District School Board Student Code of Conduct 2000)

In addition, Toronto principals are allowed to suspend for other causes, such as persistent opposition to authority, without further administrative approval.

A narrow version of appropriate citizenship behavior is encouraged also by the Ontario Ministry of Education's requirement (in the Safe Schools Act, section 304) that the national anthem "O Canada" be sung in all schools' daily opening or closing exercises. Ontario's system of rules, officially implemented the same way in Toronto and throughout the province, persistently emphasize student respect for authority, and children's responsibility (blame) for their own actions. Students for swearing at teachers (but not at peers). The Ontario Code of Conduct lists first among its purposes, "to ensure that all members of the school community, *especially people in positions of authority*, are treated with respect and dignity."... "Active and engaged citizens are aware of their rights, but *more importantly* they accept responsibility for protecting their rights and the rights of others" (section 301 p.2, emphasis added).

In contrast, Ontario's 1994 Violence Free Schools Act, established by the previous government, includes considerably less emphasis on punishment, more board- and school-level flexibility, and an emphasis on peacemaking as well as peacekeeping: "Provide for students and staff *opportunities to develop the skills* necessary to handle violent and potentially violent situations. Promote the long-term prevention of violence by preparing *students to manage* their lives and relationships in nonviolent ways," (p.5, emphasis added). Peacebuilding is also promoted in this 1994 policy: "All schools shall develop violence-prevention policy in consultation with community partners... that reflect the diversity of the community *including racial and ethnocultural groups* within the board's jurisdiction.... implementation should be *linked to* the development and implementation of other required policies such as *antiracism and ethnocultural equity* policies," p.2-3, emphasis added). This policy document is still posted on the Ministry of Education's website; the Toronto board's policy disallowing racial and sexual harassment and hate material is apparently derived from it. However, most of the programs that supported the implementation of this more comprehensive and equity-oriented policy have been cut from the Toronto school budget, and the penalties in the stricter 2000 law supplant the 1994 law's flexibility and its emphasis on teaching over punishing.

Unlike Saint John, the Toronto school board does have in place a human rights and equity policy and program infrastructure. The district's supervisor, appointed about a year ago by the province to force budget cuts that the elected board was unwilling to make, has overseen the revision and "streamlining" of all board policies, in the process often removing information about how to effectively implement them. His administration proposed in this year's budget to eliminate most of the staff and the stand-alone department supporting equity education initiatives, but for the moment this decision was reversed after a popular outcry from teachers, parents, and other citizens. Toronto's human rights and equity policies have few consequences for non-compliance and few

resources devoted to their implementation, but they still include strong statements disallowing (direct, indirect, and systemic) discrimination and harassment, and committing the board to "ensuring that education on human rights issues is provided for all staff and students" (Toronto District School Board Human Rights policy 2000, p.1 & 4). Toronto teachers are encouraged to handle controversial issues "within the context of ... the freedom... to investigate," in environments "in which conflicting sets of values are processed analytically and with respect for the differences in peoples and their cultures, identities, and world views" (Controversial and Sensitive Issues draft revised policy, 2003). Thus, like Saint John, the Toronto schools have a strict discipline and peacekeeping emphasis. However unlike Saint John, Toronto's peacekeeping regulations are counter-balanced by a safety net of human rights protections and some equity education initiatives.

Peacekeeping and assimilation-oriented peacemaking/peacebuilding: Calgary and Vancouver

As mentioned earlier, explicit peacemaking activities (especially where these would include opportunities for active student agency such as peer-assisted dispute resolution or school governance) were not particularly prominent (in policies or co-curricular programs) in any of these six cases, although there were more in the following cases than in the peacekeeping-oriented contexts above. If this finding stands up to further scrutiny, it would indicate a curious omission, given schools' ostensible commitment to the development of citizenship capabilities, and given the unsuitability of peacekeeping for actually resolving (versus suppressing) the conflicts that underlie violence.

Calgary, Alberta is a relatively homogeneous, but rapidly changing and growing, medium-sized city in the western part of the Canadian prairie region, just east of the Rocky Mountains. Its metropolitan area is not much bigger than the city itself; much of the surrounding area is rural cattle country. As in Ontario, the current provincial government of Alberta is conservative. However, unlike Ontario's network of teachers' federations, the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) has generally avoided direct polarized conflict with the provincial government and also has been quite proactive in promoting safe schools activities across the province. Vancouver, British Columbia, on the Pacific Rim, is the hub of Canada's second largest urban area, surrounded by densely-populated suburban cities. Vancouver's School Board represents the city core, not the whole metropolitan area, thus its school board (60 000 students) is actually smaller than Calgary's (96 500 students). Like Toronto, Vancouver's population is remarkably diverse and global in its character; almost 30% of the metropolitan area's residents are of Chinese origin, nearly half are visible minorities, and about 2% (most of whom live in certain neighborhoods of central Vancouver) are of Aboriginal (Native North American) origin. The Vancouver schools, like so many others, recently have been enduring a series of deep budget cuts.

The Calgary Board of Education's School Discipline policy (2002), like Saint John's, forbids a wide range of behaviors: about 1/3 of the offenses listed (such as threats, assault, possession of a weapon in school, and harassment) are violent; the majority involve other misbehavior (such as willful damage to property, disobedience or defiance of authority, and interfering with the orderly

conduct of classes). Unlike Saint John or Toronto, however, in Calgary authority is delegated to individual school personnel to decide exactly what conduct is unacceptable and to mete out consequences that may take context and individual factors into account. (I am unaware of any clear evidence about whether flexible policies necessarily result in more equitable implementation than standardized policies.) Furthermore, Calgary's policy builds in some human rights protections. Individuals must be treated "in a manner which is demonstrably fair, objective, consistent and reasonable" (School Discipline p.5-6) and students must respect "ethnic, racial, religious and gender differences" (p.6-7). Abuse of authority by teachers is specifically disallowed:

> School and classroom discipline must ... avoid threats, enticements and other measures which may be regarded as coercive.... [and] concentrate upon the development of positive school practices and effective teaching as a means of encouraging appropriate student behavior....
> When disciplining students, teachers must not use
> (a) physical threat or attacks upon the student
> (b) corporal punishment
> (c) mass detention or mass punishment aimed at unspecified individuals or groups
> (d) verbal attacks such as racism, racial or personal references, or deliberate humiliation
>
> (Calgary School Discipline policy 2002, p.5-6,9)

Calgary's Personal and Sexual Harassment policy also recommends punishment up to and including expulsion for students (and dismissal for adults), for intimidation, threats, ostracism, offensive gestures or remarks, bullying, or "behavior that denies an individual's dignity and respect and is demeaning" based on bias including "age, race, national or ethnic origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability or impairment, sources of income, and family status" (2000 p.2,4). Thus Calgary's policy attempts to limit behavior such as humiliation and discriminatory acts that might contribute to violence as well as violent acts in general, and also attempts to limit adults' use of coercion.

The Calgary school district does not rely only on punishment policies. Its recent Anti-Racism and Equity Policy (1998), and Multiculturalism Regulation encourage staff development and student programs to facilitate the development of "appreciation of diversity" and "cross-cultural competency," in part through curricular emphasis on "the contributions of all cultural groups to Canadian history, literature and life" (1984 p.1). The policy also encourages "the maintenance and enhancement of students' heritage language," and the use of interpreters to facilitate placement and home-school communication for non-English speaking families (Multiculturalism Regulation 1984, p.1-2). The tools, personnel, and structures for implementing these equity education policies are not evident in the public co-curricular material or the board's administrative departments, although they may be somewhat covered in formal curriculum materials.

More evident resources are allocated to a range of anti-violence initiatives, and there has been some recent attention to identifying and assisting individual

students at risk of academic failure, without any particularly emphasis on equity matters. About a quarter of Calgary's schools were listed on its website as having some sort of social skills or "bullyproofing" program, in particular one called "Dare to Care" created by Calgary Family Services. The Alberta Teachers Association sponsors a very active and visible Safe and Caring Schools initiative involving support for a variety of programs at many schools around the province, as well as a smaller Diversity, Equity and Human Rights program that provides resource links on inclusivity and anti-racism. Thus the Calgary school district, with the support of the teachers federation, has some peacemaking and peacebuilding education initiatives in place; these activities generally tend somewhat more toward avoidance of conflict than embracing it as a learning opportunity.

Like Calgary, the Vancouver School Board has a set of policies spelling out a range of violent behavior that is disallowed, and it delegates (even wider) discretion to school-level personnel to identify specific offenses and to determine consequences (except that police involvement is mandatory for weapons offences). Broad disciplinary principles assert the importance of respect for self, for others, and for property. As in Calgary, Vancouver's Violence Prevention (1995) and Hate Crimes and Propaganda (1991) policies (both revised 1999) encourage staff development and the teaching of skills and awareness to students, in addition to punishment. Unlike in Calgary, Vancouver's policies focus directly on forbidding violence (including bias-based violence and hate propaganda), not on authority or misbehavior in general. Vancouver provides enabling structures for some human rights protections: parents may appeal to a Student Discipline Review Committee (with parent and staff representation) to resolve disagreements over discipline or punishment (Student Suspension/Exclusion policy 1977, revised 1996). The Student Code of Conduct includes Rights and Responsibilities (1994, revised 1999). At the same time, Vancouver's harassment regulation allows for an "informal resolution process" (apparently mediation) "to resolve the complaint between the Complainant and Respondent" (Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism Regulation 1995, revised 1999, p.2). Much as I favor the use of negotiation-based conflict resolution processes, this policy seems rather naïve about the power imbalances embodied in bias-based harassment.

Apparently somewhat more than in Calgary, even though it's a smaller school district, the Vancouver school district has allocated some resources to peacemaking and peacebuilding, as well as peacekeeping. Discipline policies emphasize the importance of proactive education over punishment. Another policy discourages the use of violent computer games and encourages activities "that promote peace and understanding among the people of the world," including an annual walk for peace (Activities Promoting Peace 1986, revised 1999, p.1). Another policy requires the development of student councils in every secondary school, and ensures that 100% of students are eligible to be nominated for election (presumably meaning that they can't be excluded on the basis of grades; Student Government 1974, revised 1999). A Safe Schools Center resource collection includes some conflict resolution education as well as more control-oriented violence-reduction implementation materials. Thus apparently there are at least a few opportunities for some Vancouver students to practice peacemaking

In addition to disallowing harassment, Vancouver's Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism policy commits the school board to provide "human, material, and financial resources" to support multiculturalism and anti-racism (1999, p.1). The Equal Educational Opportunities policy commits the board to non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, ancestry, ethnic origin, religion, socio-economic status, gender, sexual orientation, political beliefs, physical or mental ability, and to staff development on these matters (1978, revised 1999, p.1). The Vancouver board allocates tangible staff resources to support inclusivity and equity, including Multicultural Liaison Workers (staff from "ethnic communities" who offer student counseling and interpretation services for families in eight minority languages), 17 First Nations Support Workers, two First Nations Resource Teachers, a First Nations Transition Youth and Family Worker, and an Aboriginal Education Department and an Aboriginal Education Advisory Committee. The emphasis of the programs seems to be primarily oriented toward access and remediation for non-majority students, not particularly anti-bias or inter-group communication, but (as Akiba and colleagues' research indicated) even this kind of attention to equity is associated with peacebuilding.

As in New Brunswick, Ontario, and Alberta, safe school matters have been of concern in British Columbia and Vancouver for considerable time. The British Columbia Teachers Federation sponsored a Violence In Schools Task Force that published an extensive report in 1994, more recently published a "Focus on Bullying" document, and currently co-sponsors with the provincial Ministry of Education an extensive Safe Schools Resource Center. The BC Ministry of Education also currently sponsors a Safe Schools Task Force. The policy and program infrastructures of the Vancouver and Calgary school districts seem to promote the value of nonviolent behavior, rather than simply promoting deference and obedience.

Comprehensive Peacebuilding — Winnipeg and Halifax

Winnipeg, Manitoba and Halifax, Nova Scotia are medium-large Canadian urban districts. Winnipeg is a fairly large and growing city in the northeastern part of Canada's Prairie region. The city's public district has 78 schools. Winnipeg has an important Aboriginal community (8.6% of the city population and about 25% of the public district's current students), as well as a population of diverse European immigrant groups who have been there for generations. The largest language group, beyond English and French, in the 2001 census population was German (spoken by 3.6% of Winnipeg's residents). A substantial population of more recently-arrived immigrants hail from the Philippines, South Asia, and elsewhere. Winnipeg also has an early-twentieth-century history of strong labor organizing and related political protest. The metropolitan area of Halifax, in Canada's eastern Maritimes region, is about half the size of Winnipeg but has a larger public school district. Halifax is one of Canada's older cities, including a strong Black community (currently 4% of the city's population) with a history of segregation, discrimination, and resistance since the eighteenth century. The dominant population of Halifax (about 90%) is white, mainly of Scots, English, and other western European extraction. Many of Halifax's newest immigrants are from the Middle East: more than 1% of the city population speaks Arabic. At about the same time as in Toronto, Halifax'

municipal government and school board were amalgamated with neighboring municipalities and school boards, including the nearby city of Dartmouth. The new Halifax Regional School Board has 137 schools.

Similar to Calgary and Vancouver, the Code of Conduct of Winnipeg School Division 1 delegates specific authority for discipline and punishment to individual school personnel, except that suspensions of more than a week must be approved by the Superintendent or Board of Trustees. As in Vancouver's policy framework, the emphasis in Winnipeg is on preventing violence. Expulsion is allowed only for the following violent offenses (not required; suspension or school transfer are also options):

- use of a weapon to threaten or inflict injury
- physical assault
- verbal threats
- "unprovoked assault resulting in injury"

Suspension is allowed (not required) for other misbehaviors, about three fifths of them violent:

- physical assault
- verbal assault
- weapons on school property

- chemical abuse (tobacco, alcohol, controlled substances)
- misconduct

(— Winnipeg School Division Code of Conduct, from Discipline Policy 1988, Suspension of Students Policy 1992, Expulsion of Students Policy 1986).

Winnipeg's Code of Conduct also includes an expectation for students and staff to resolve conflicts peacefully and to behave respectfully toward all regardless of diversity. However, no particular consequences for associated misbehavior are specified at the board level.

Some support for peacemaking education is evident in Winnipeg: the Developing Safe School Communities program of the district's Student Support Services office offers professional development to staff and parents, "for development of a climate which fosters positive behavior." A thick Conflict Resolution teaching support manual is among nine resource documents distributed free by the district office. Selected students are empowered to participate in peacekeeping through a School Safety Patrol program established in 1981: Winnipeg Police officers provide on-site training sessions for student participants and their adult advisors at all the district's elementary schools, every year. The provincial government provides resource documents for curriculum development and implementation in Problem Solving and Human Relations, among four cross-curricular "foundation skill areas."

The Winnipeg School Division's Multicultural Education policy articulates the goals of "education for full participation in society; education for cultural and linguistic development" including heritage language development, and "education for intercultural understanding" that should "assist students in dealing with incidents of stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and racism" (1988, revised 1992, p.2). The district, with additional resource and consultative

support from the provincial Department of Education and Training, provides tangible support for achieving these goals (see also district policies for Heritage Language Instruction and Curriculum Integration). English as a Second Language, bilingual languages of instruction (Ukranian and Hebrew), and several languages of study including two aboriginal languages (Spanish, Japanese, Cree, Ojibwe, Filipino, and French) are supported by materials distributed by the district's Prince Charles Educational Resource Centre, and by district-employed Community Liaison Officers. In addition to the foundational skill areas mentioned above, other provincial "integrated" curriculum support documents include Differentiated Instruction (adaptation to student differences), Aboriginal Perspectives, Gender Fairness, Appropriate Age Portrayals (resisting bias against the elderly), Human Diversity, Anti-Racist/Anti-Bias Education ("challenge bias and discrimination"), and Sustainable Development (including four handbooks supporting science curriculum integration, grades 5 through high school, published between 1993 and 2000).

Aboriginal Education is an evident priority for the Winnipeg district and the Manitoba provincial government. Elementary and secondary-level Aboriginal Education Consultants, and provincially-employed Aboriginal Awareness Consultants, assist schools in developing, adapting, and implementing curriculum and instructional materials and give classroom presentations. What is most notable about Winnipeg's Aboriginal Education policy (1996) and program framework is that it emphasizes positive education about Aboriginal peoples for non-aboriginals as well as educational and social support for Aboriginal students. A series of Native Studies Resource Books (Early Years, Middle Years, and Senior Years) are designed for integration into social studies curriculum at every grade level. The district also has a coordinated framework for teaching Aboriginal Languages and Culture across the curriculum. Thus this policy and program framework support peacebuilding on multiple levels.

The Winnipeg community and the Manitoba Teachers Society (MTS) show concern for equity in relation to violence and peacebuilding. Recent workshops offered by the MTS, described in its *Equality News* periodical, include Sexual Harassment, Native Studies, Terrorism and Racism, and Confronting Homophobia as well as Differentiating Instruction. The school board's identified priorities for 2002-03 include strengthening Aboriginal Education initiatives, improving program delivery for special needs students, strengthening instructional and assessment strategies for all students, in addition to "continued on-going areas for attention" including Facilities Management, Technology, and Human Rights/ Anti-Homophobia. The Winnipeg district's priorities seem to focus on inclusive citizenship education and on handling the bias problems that often underlie violence, more than on merely controlling violent symptoms.

As in Winnipeg, the Halifax Regional School Board's Student Behavior and Discipline Policy (1997), which is almost identical to the School Code of Conduct prescribed by the Nova Scotia Department of Education (2001), advocates flexible application of behavior control strategies, and delegates primary authority to school-based personnel. Two thirds of the "severely disruptive behavior" for which administrators are allowed to suspend students (for up to 5 days) involves violence: verbal abuse, racial and/or discriminatory misconduct, sexual misconduct (harassment, assault, or abuse), physical

violence, use or possession of weapons. Optional consequences, beyond the five day suspension, require the involvement of a School Discipline Committee at the district administrative level. A few essentially nonviolent behaviors (including vandalism, disruptions to school operations, or illegal activity) also can be punished with suspension (1997, p.5). There appears to be more space for leniency than in some other districts: fighting or scuffling that does not result in serious injury is considered disruptive but not "severely" disruptive, thus suspension is not mandatory. Halifax district guidelines emphasize that consequences should be chosen "primarily for their educational value" (p.6), that disciplinary procedures "must recognize and respect cultural diversity and individual differences" (p.1), that students should be "actively involved in the development and implementation of the school and classroom codes of behaviour" (p.2), and that the ultimate goal of the discipline policy is students' development of understanding and autonomous self-management (p.1, 8).

As in Calgary, human rights protections are included in Halifax' Student Behaviour and Discipline policy. For example, teachers are explicitly forbidden to abuse their power by administering corporal punishment, group punishment, or use of academic work or evaluation procedures as disciplinary measures —p.7). A School Discipline Committee review is mandated for punishments more severe than a five-day suspension. A large proportion of suspension consequences are carried out in school, giving students access to professional supervision and support. The school board commits itself "to work towards increasing the availability of such [in-school suspension] opportunities throughout" the newly-amalgamated regional school board (p.10).

The Halifax Student Behaviour and Discipline policy advocates conflict management and problem solving support for individual cases, such as the involvement of a mentor, peer or professional counselor, psychiatrist, support staff, involvement of community agencies, or peer mediation (p.10). Furthermore, the policy asserts that positive programs to teach and promote pro-social behavior, respect for differences, and conflict resolution are "essential" in every school. It lists examples of such programs including peer mediation, creative conflict resolution, anti-racism and anti-sexism, as well as more conflict-avoidance oriented programs such as anger management and bullying prevention (p.16). A more recent policy also commits the board to implement in-service training programs for all staff regarding pro-social curricula and "the identification, de-escalation, and resolution of conflict," so that "students and staff will learn and practice methods to resolve conflict in a peaceful and respectful manner" (Safe, Secure, and Healthy Schools, 2002, p.2). The Nova Scotia Teachers Union sponsors an extensive Anti-Violence Resource Library and a range of teacher activities and events, including support for programs such as peer mediation, Conflict-Free School, Partners for Peace, and peace festivals. Thus the initial analysis of the Halifax public district shows the strongest apparent commitment to peacemaking education in any of the six cases.

The Halifax school district's evident commitment to peacebuilding citizenship education is equally strong. This is supported primarily through the many programs of the Race Relations, Cross-Cultural Understanding, and Human Rights (RCH) department. This department "provides opportunities for individuals to learn from one another, to nurture and recognize the talents and abilities of all students and staff... but also to enable all interested partners to

gain learning and leadership abilities in this area" (website). RCH programs include programming assistance to specific schools "who have identified critical RCH 'whole school' concerns," a RCH and Sexual Harassment School Volunteer program, support for curriculum and program development, in-service training, English as a Second Language support, and review of materials for bias. In addition, the League of Peaceful Schools was born in the Halifax region: this organization, whose Executive Director's salary is shared by the Halifax Regional School Board and the Nova Scotia Department of Education, supports comprehensive peacemaking and peacebuilding programs in several Halifax (and other Nova Scotia) schools. Like Winnipeg, Halifax school district seems to have in place quite comprehensive peacebuilding (including relatively non-punitive peacekeeping and peacemaking) education opportunities for diverse students.

Discussion

Some of the most citizenship-relevant learning opportunities are those conflict management, discipline, and human rights/diversity practices that are taught implicitly through regularized repetition and regulation in urban school districts. These policies and programs both *express* the values of the leaders and citizens who have shaped and installed them, and also *promote* those values through modeling, practice, regulatory sanctions, and support resources. The implicit nature of many students' encounters with these value-laden frameworks makes them potentially powerful influences, precisely because the underlying values are not often discussed nor critiqued. There is democratic educative value in bringing assumed practices and priorities out into the open, to provoke explicit deliberations about the values and choices that give them meaning.

This paper has described quite different patterns of citizenship education practices designed to achieve safe and inclusive schools in various urban public school system contexts. Some of Canada's urban school districts practice very strict and narrow regulation of students' behavior, leaving very little evident space for enjoying diversity or reducing inequity in the ways violence are managed. Furthermore, in the name of school safety, a wide range of nonviolent disobedience is sometimes treated as harshly as violence. Other Canadian city school districts have developed a somewhat more comprehensive array of safe and inclusive schools initiatives, relying much less heavily on standardized punishment of insubordination and instead involving students in various learning opportunities for conflict management and/or appreciation of diversity. There, conflict and difference are embraced as normal and acceptable aspects of the schools' community operations.

Certainly these policies must be shaped in part by the viewpoints and experiences of the particular mix of demographic groups who live there. At the same time, neither the size nor the degree of diversity (for example the proportion of visible minority citizens) in a city population are sufficient to explain which of these six cities adopted which policy approaches. Clearly political will and understanding, as expressed through citizens' and educators' policy-influencing actions, can make a substantial difference and also can change quite quickly (as in Toronto).

To claim to be neutral, as do some one-size-fits-all strict discipline policies, is to mislead. A discipline, conflict management, multiculturalism, or human

rights policy that claims to treat all 'disruptions' the same embodies values about conflict and difference that have implications for diverse citizens' relative power and opportunities. Diverse students are likely to develop opinions about the relative merit of themselves and others by observing the ways students from various social groups are treated by adults in school. As Brantlinger (1994) found in interviewing working-class and relatively affluent students who attended a particular middle school together, a wide range of students may internalize the general belief that the relatively privileged students are 'good students,' whereas the less privileged students are 'poor students' or 'trouble makers' who deserve the harsher treatment they received from teachers. A strict discipline regime that relies on exclusion and punishment for peacekeeping is more likely to implicitly communicate the superiority of some students over others, compared to a more intentionally-inclusive peacebuilding regime that balances peacekeeping efforts with inter-group communication and dialogue and non-punitive conflict resolution. A policy framework that acknowledges both diversity and inequity by teaching anti-racism and by firmly sanctioning hate-based harassment is no more biased than a policy that ignores diversity, but it embodies and teaches different values. Rather than seeking the ever-elusive neutrality, democratic citizenship educators would be better served by clarifying our most cherished values, such as nonviolence and justice, and examining our deeds as well as words to enhance our consistency in practicing and promoting those values.

References

Acker, S. (1999). *The Realities of Teachers' Work: Never a Dull Moment*. London: Continuum.

Akiba, M., G. LeTendre, D. Baker, B. Goesling (2003). "Student victimization: National and school system effects on school violence in 37 nations." *American Educational Research Journal* 39:4 (Winter), 829-853.

Alladin, M. I. (1996). *Racism in Canadian Schools*. Harcourt-Brace Canada.

American Bar Association (2000). *Final Report, Bi Partisan Working Group on Youth Violence to 106th Congress*. <http://www.jlc.org/home/updates/updates_links/report_youthviolence.htm> (February).

Aronson, E. (2000). *Nobody Left to Hate: Teaching Compassion after Columbine*. NY: Worth Publishers.

Avery, P., Sullivan, J. & Wood, S. (1997). "Teaching for tolerance of diverse beliefs." *Theory Into Practice* 36:1 (Winter), 32-38.

Banks, C. M., & Banks, J. (1995). "Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education." *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 152-158.

Bar-Tal , D. (2001). "The Elusive Nature of Peace Education" In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (27-36).

Bergsgaard, M. (1997). "Gender issues in the implementation and evaluation of a violence-prevention curriculum." *Canadian Journal of Education* 22:1 (Fall), 33-45.

Bettman, E. & Moore, P. (1994). "Conflict resolution programs and social justice." *Education and Urban Society* 27:1 (November), 11-21.

Bickford, S. (1996). *The Dissonance of Democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bickmore, K. (1993). Learning inclusion/ inclusion in learning: Citizenship education for a pluralistic society. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 21:4 (Fall), 341-384.

Bickmore, K. (1997). "Preparation for pluralism: curricular and extra-curricular practice with conflict resolution." *Theory Into Practice* 36:1 (Winter), 3-10.

Bickmore, K. (1998). "Teacher development for conflict resolution." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 24:1 (Spring), 53-69.

Bickmore, K. (1999a). "Elementary curriculum about conflict resolution: can children handle global politics?" Theory and Research in Social Education 27:1 (Winter), 45-69.
Bickmore, K. (1999b) "Teaching conflict and conflict resolution in school: (Extra-) Curricular considerations." In A. Raviv. et. al. (Eds.), *How Children Understand War and Peace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 233-259.
Bickmore, K. (2001). "Student conflict resolution, power 'sharing' in schools, and citizenship education." *Curriculum Inquiry* 31:2 (June).
Bickmore, K. (2002a). "Good training is not enough: research on peer mediation training and program implementation." *Peace Education for a New Century* theme issue, *Journal of Social Alternatives* 31:1.
Bickmore, K. (2002b). "How might social education resist (hetero)sexism? Facing the impact of gender and sexual ideology on citizenship." *Theory and Research in Social Education* (Summer), 198-216.
Bickmore, K. (2003a). "Peer Mediation Training and Program Implementation in Elementary Schools: Research Results." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 20:2 (February), 137-160.y
Bickmore, K. (2003b). "Conflict Resolution Education: Multiple Options for Contributing to Just and Democratic Peace."In W. Pammer & J. Killian (Eds.) *Handbook of Conflict Management.* Marcel-Dekker Publishers.
Boler, M. (1997). "The risks of empathy: interrogating multiculturalism's gaze." *Cultural Studies* 11:2, 253-273.
Boulding, E. (1988) *Building a Global Civic Culture.* Teachers College Press.
Brantlinger, E. (1994) "The Social class embeddedness of middle school students' thinking about teachers." *Theory Into Practice* 33:3, 191-198.
Brooks, K., Schiraldi, V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2000). *Schoolhouse Hype: Two Years Later.* Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute and Children's Law Center (April).
Bush, K. & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children.* Florence, IT: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
Burstyn, Joan. et.al. (2001). *Preventing Violence in Schools: A Challenge to American Democracy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Callender, C. & Wright, C. (2000). "Discipline and democracy: race, gender, school sanctions and control." In M. Arnot & J. Dillabough (Eds.), *Challenging Democracy: International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship,* 216-237. London: Routledge.
Carruthers, W., Carruthers, B. Day-Vines, N. Bostick, D. & Watson, D. (1996). "Conflict resolution as curriculum." *The School Counselor* 43, 345-373.
Christie, D., R. Wagner, & D. DuNann Winter (eds) (2001). *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Close, C. & Lechmann, K. (1997). "Fostering youth leadership: Students train students and adults in conflict resolution." *Theory Into Practice* 36:1 (Winter), 11-16.
Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing groupwork: strategies for the heterogeneous classroom,* second edition. NY: Teachers College Press.
Craig & Pepler (1999). "Children who bully: Will they just grow out of it?" *Orbit* 29:4, 16-19.
Cuban, L. (2001). "How systemic reform harms urban schools." *Education Week* <www.edweek.org> (May 30).
Cunningham, C., Cunningham, L., Martorelli, V., Tran, A., Young, J. and Zacharias, R. (1998). "The effects of primary division, student-mediated conflict resolution programs on playground aggression." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 39:5, 653-662.
Curle, A. (1971). *Making Peace.* London: Tavistock Publications.
Curle, A. & Dugan, Maire (1982). Peacemaking: stages and sequence. *Peace and Change* vol. 8 nol 2/3 (Summer), pp. 19-28.
Currie, F. & Covell, K. (1998). "Juvenile justice and juvenile decision making: a comparison of youth offenders with their non-offending peers." *The International Journal of Children's Rights* 6(2), 125-138.
Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). "Standards and assessments: where we are and what we need." *Teachers College Record* on-line ,www.tcrecord.org. (February 16).
Deutsch, M. (1993). "Educating for a peaceful world." *American Psychologist* 48:5 (May), 510-517.
Dietz, M. (1989). "Context is all: feminism and theories of citizenship." In J. Conway, S. Bourque, & J. Scott (Eds.) *Learning About Women: Gender, Politics and Power* (1-24). Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. Michigan.

Duryea, M. L. (1992). *Conflict and Culture: A Literature Review and Bibliography.* Victoria: U. Victoria Inst. for Dispute Resolution.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address.* NY: Teachers College.

Epp, J.R. & Watkinson, A.M. (Editors, 1996). *Systemic Violence: How Schools Hurt Children.* London: Falmer.

Epstein, D. & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling Sexualities* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Fields, B. (1998). "Interpersonal conflict in schools: How teachers manage conflict in the workplace." *Education and Society* 16:1, 55-72.

Fisk, L. (2000). "Shaping visionaries: Nurturing peace through education." In Fisk, L. & Schellenberg, J. (Eds.), *Patterns of Conflict, Paths to Peace.* Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 159-193.

Forcey, L.R. & Harris, I.M. (Eds.). *Peacebuilding for Adolescents: Strategies for Educators and Community Leaders.* NY: Peter Lang.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N. & Short-Camilli, C. (2000). *Bullyproofing your School: A Comprehensive Approach for Elementary Schools,* 2 edition. Longmont, Colorado: Sopris West.

Gordon, R., Della Piana, L., & Keleher, T. (2000, March). *Facing the consequences: An examination of racial discrimination in U.S. public schools.* Oakland: Applied Research Center.

Gordon, T., Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (2000). *Making Spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools.* St. Martin's Press.

Greenberg, B. (1995). "Identifying and resolving conflict in multicultural settings." *NASSP Bulletin* vol. 79 no. 567 (January), pp. 51-61.

Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Hahn, C. (1998). *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education.* Albany: State University of New York Press

Harris, I. (1999). "Types of peace education." In A. Raviv. et. al. (Eds.), *How Children Understand War and Peace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 299-317.

Henry, A. (1994). "The Empty Shelf and other Curricular Challenges of Teaching for Children of African Descent." *Urban Education.* 29 no.3, 298-319.

Houser, N. (1996). "Negotiating dissonance and safety for the common good: social education in the elementary classroom." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24:3 (Summer), 294-312.

Horowitz, S. & Boardman, S. (1994). "Managing conflict: policy and research implications." *Journal of Social Issues* 50:1, 197-211.

Houser, N. (1996). "Negotiating dissonance and safety for the common good: social education in the elementary classroom." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24:3 (Summer), 294-312.

James, S. (1992). "The 'good-enough' citizen." In G. Bock & S. James (Eds.), *Beyond Equality and Difference.* London: Routledge (48-65).

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1996). "Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools." *Review of Educational Research* 66:4 (Winter), 459-506.

Johnston, R. (2000). "Federal data highlight disparities in discipline." *Education Week* 19:41 (June 21), p.3.

Jones, T. (1998). "Research supports effectiveness of peer mediation." *The Fourth R* 82, 1, 10-12, 18, 21-27.

Jull, S. (2000). "Youth violence, schools and the management question: a discussion of zero tolerance and equity in public schooling." *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy,* 17. On-line: www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap .

Kahne, J. (1996). "The Eight-Year Study: evaluating progresive education." In J. Kahne, *Reframing Educational Policy.* NY: Teachers College, 119-146.

Kriesberg, L. (1982). "Social conflict theories and conflict resolution." *Peace and Change* vol. 8(2/3), 3-17.

Larkin, J. (1994). *Sexual Harassment: High Schools Girls Speak Out.* Toronto: Second Story Press.

Lederach, J.P. (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press).

Lewis, C. (1996). "Beyond conflict resolution skills: How do children develop the will to solve conflicts at school?" *New Directions for Child Development* 73 (Fall), 91-106.
Leyton, E. (2000). Youth violence: A Generation no better, no worse. *Globe and Mail* (April 21), A11.
McCadden, B.M. (1998). "Why is Michael always getting timed out? Race, class and disciplining other people's children." In R.E. Butchart & B. McEwan (Eds.), *Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education* (pp. 109-134). Albany: State University of New York Press.
McCaskell, T. (1999). "Homophobic violence in schools." *Orbit* 29:4, 20-21.
McCauley, C. (2002). "Head first versus feet first in peace education." In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (247-258).
MacDonald, I. (1996). "Expanding the lens: Student perceptions of school violence." In J. Epp & A. Watkinson (Eds), *Systemic Violence: How Schools Hurt Children.* London: Falmer. pp. 83-92.
Merelman, R.(1990). "The Role of conflict in children's political learning." In O. Ichilov (Ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy* (47-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
Metz, M.H. (2002). "In the aftermath: the ivory tower and the city school as sources of insight." *Teachers College Record* on-line <www.tcrecord.org> (September 3).
Mock, K. (1995). "Combatting racism and hate in Canada today: Lessons of the Holocaust." *Canadian Social Studies* 29 (4, Summer), 143-146.
Morrison, A. (2000). "Disentangling disputes: Conflict in the international arena." .In Fisk, L. & Schellenberg, J. (Eds.), *Patterns of Conflict, Paths to Peace.* Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 67-101.
Moyer, K.C. (2001). "Opportunities and challenges of restorative justice and Canada's proposed Youth Criminal Justice Act." *Interaction* 14 (2, June), 14-15.
Noguera, P. (1995). "Preventing and producing violence: a critical analysis of responses to school violence." *Harvard Educational Review* 65:2 (Summer), 189-212.
Opffer, E. (1997). "Toward cultural transformation: Comprehensive approaches to conflict resolution." *Theory Into Practice* 36:1, 46-52.
Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (1998). "Children's rights and citizenship: some implications for the management of schools." *International Journal of Children's Rights* 6, 313-333.
Pepler, D. & W. Craig (1994). "About bullying: understanding this underground activity." *Orbit* 25:3, 32-34.
Powell, K., Dahlberg, L., Friday, J., Mercy, J., Thornton, T., & Crawford, S. (1996). "Prevention of Youth Violence: Rationale and Characteristics of 15 Evaluation Projects." Reprinted from *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* by National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, CDC, Atlanta.
Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility.* NY: Teachers College Press.
Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (Eds.) (2002), *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Schwartz, W. (2001). "School Practices for Equitable Discipline of African American Students." *ERIC* Digest Number 166 (September, EDO-UD-01-5). <http://eric-web.tc.columbia.edu/digests/dig166.html>
Sheets, R. H., & Gay, G. (1996, May). "Student perceptions of disciplinary conflict in ethnically diverse classrooms." *NASSP Bulletin, 80*(580), 84-94.
Slee, R. (1995), *Changing Theories and Practices of Discipline.* London: Falmer Press.
Skiba, R. & Peterson, R. (1999). "The dark side of zero tolerance: can punishment lead to safe schools?" *Phi Delta Kappan* (January), 372-382.
Stein, N. (1995). "Sexual harassment in school: the public performance of gendered violence." *Harvard Educational Review* 65:2, 145-162.
Teotino, I. (2003). "Edmonton's new anti-bullying bylaw has ripple effect across country." *Canadian Press* <www.canada.com> (March 23).
Townley, A. (Editor, 1994), "Conflict Resolution, Diversity, and Social Justice" Special Issue of *Education and Urban Society* vol. 27 no. 1 (November).
Werner, W. (1991). "Curriculum and uncertainty." In R. Ghosh & D. Ray (Eds.), *Social Change and Education in Canada,* 2nd edn. Toronto: Harcourt Brace (105-115).

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Discipline for democracy? Neutrality + justice in schools' management of conflict + socia l exclusion

Author(s): Kathy Bickmore

Corporate Source: OISE/University of Toronto

Publication Date: 2003 (April)

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Kathy Bickmore

Printed Name/Position/Title: Kathy Bickmore, Associate Professor

Organization/Address: OISE/UT - CTL Dept. 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, ON M5S1V6 Canada

Telephone:

FAX:

E-Mail Address: kbickmore@oise.utoronto.ca

Date: 24 April '03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)